

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
3

4 Oscar Perez-Marquez,
5 Petitioner,
6 v.
7 Jo Gentry, et al.,
8 Respondents
9

2:17-cv-02335-JAD-CWH
Service Order

10 On November 3, 2017, I directed the Clerk of the Court to serve respondents
11 electronically and then for respondents to answer or otherwise respond to the petition.¹
12 Respondents have not yet filed anything or appeared in this case. It appears from the docket that
13 the electronic service upon respondents did not go to the general-filings mailbox for the Attorney
14 General of the State of Nevada after Adam Paul Laxalt was added to the case.²

15 The Clerk of Court is directed to **electronically SERVE** upon respondents a **copy of the**
16 **petition [ECF No. 1], the November 3, 2017, order [ECF No. 3], and this order.**

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents will have 45 days from the date of entry of
18 this order to answer or otherwise respond to the petition. Respondents must raise all potential
19 affirmative defenses in the initial responsive pleading, including untimeliness, lack of
20 exhaustion, and procedural default. Successive motions to dismiss will not be entertained. If
21 respondents file and serve an answer, then they must comply with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing
22 Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and then Perez-Marquez will have 45
23
24
25

26 _____
27 ¹ ECF No. 3.

28 ² ECF No. 1 regenerated filing receipt.

1
2 days from the date on which the answer is served to reply. If respondents file a motion, then the
3 briefing schedule of Local Rule LR 7-2 will apply.

4 DATED: January 4, 2018.

5
6 
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey